

April 29, 2011

Mr. Keith Pratt, Chairman Town of Barrington Building Committee 41 Province Lane Barrington, New Hampshire 03825

Re: Town Hall Building

Dear Mr. Pratt:

As requested *The Scott Lawson Group, Ltd. (SLGL)* is providing this letter to attempt to clarify our position regarding the town hall building.

Several rounds of airborne mold spore testing within the building conducted in the fall of 2010 generally yielded the same results. High spore count levels within building wall cavities and relatively low or "normal" levels within occupied areas of the building. In most cases, building occupants should not experience adverse health effects based on these types of sampling results. However, as related to *SLGL*, a significant percentage of building occupants have experienced health effects that they relate to time spent in the building. Recently *SLGL* has also been informed that these complaints are persisting and may have increased in number. It may be that building occupants are being adversely affected by the wall cavity contamination in some way not measurable by the current testing that has been done. In fact, current industry mold testing methods may not be able to show conclusively how or if the wall cavity contamination may be affecting building occupants, such as through mold mycotoxin exposure.

As stated in our letter of January, and in other correspondence since, *SLGL* agrees with the opinion of others that the overall "ideal" solution or option to eliminate building occupant complaints is to move the offices to another location. We have previously indicated that another possible "option" for the town to consider would be remaining in place, while implementing a comprehensive remediation plan. However, by remaining in the building, and especially considering that there are no current plans for remediation, the town will incur certain risks that will include some level of continued building occupant complaints, and possible legal ramifications.



There have also been some general discussions regarding other possible measures/options that could potentially be taken in an attempt to reduce occupant exposures to mold. These include as feasible; carpet removal, attempting to better seal of wall cavity areas from the building interior, putting the building under positive pressure, etc. Although some or all of these measures <u>may</u> improve building air quality, the underlying problem of the wall contamination will remain, and therefore some occupant complaints may persist.

The town is in the unenviable position of having to weigh many factors when considering whether to vacate the building. These include the cost of moving, the cost and effectiveness of any interim remediation methods, and the continued adverse reactions of building occupants in the current location. In addition, in our opinion, they are faced with no clear cut or black and white answer to the question of whether the current building is "safe" for occupancy.

However, considering the continued or possibly growing number of building occupant complaints, and the time, expense, and possible limited effectiveness of interim remediation methods, *SLGL* now feels that the best option is to move the offices to another location.

Sincerely,

The Scott Lawson Group, Ltd.

Richard Lent

Director of Technical Services